

4.0 Agency Scoping Meeting Minutes

4.1 Meeting Objectives – Christina Martinez

This meeting was held on January 27, 2004, from 10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. at the Kirkland City Hall. The main objective of the agency scoping meeting was to present the Kirkland Nickel Project to agencies with jurisdiction and to identify local concerns and issues. The issues identified at these meetings will be incorporated into the environmental and design processes. All scoping comments will be addressed in further detail as part of our scoping process and documented within the scoping report. Public concerns and issues will be identified later in the day at a public scoping meeting at Kirkland City Hall, Peter Kirk Room. Other meeting objectives included:

- Learn about the I-405 Kirkland Nickel Project
- Identify public and agency concerns
- Facilitate an efficient environmental review and document preparation process
- Ensure the environmental documents adequately address relevant issues
- Define issues to be examined in detail and those that cause no concern
- Meet each other and hear concerns of other agencies with jurisdiction

4.2 Introductions – Christina Martinez

Christina explained that she was going to act as the facilitator for this meeting and asked if everyone was okay with her doing that. No one objected. Christina then asked each person to introduce who they were, what agency or jurisdiction they were representing, and what concerns they may have regarding the Kirkland Nickel Project. Participants at the meeting included the following:

- Eddie Low – City of Bothell
- Kurt Buchanan – Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
- Bob Penhale – Washington State Department of Ecology
- Joung Lee – Federal Transit Administration
- Nancy Brennan-Dubbs – U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- Terry Swanson – Washington State Department of Ecology
- Terry Marpert – City of Redmond
- Dave Godfrey – City of Kirkland
- Joe Seet – City of Woodinville
- John Anderson – Puget Sound Clean Air Agency
- Ann Martin – King County Department of Transportation
- Jim Leonard – Federal Highway Administration
- Bernard Van DeKamp – City of Bellevue
- Eric Shields – City of Kirkland
- Keith McGowan – I-405 Project Team, Environmental Coordinator
- Ed Murray – I-405 Project Team, NEPA Deliverables Leader
- Jim Jordan – I-405 Project Team, NEPA Document Coordinator

- Eric Wolin – I-405 Project Team, Environmental Coordination Assistant
- Denise Cieri – I-405 Project Team, Bellevue/Kirkland Segment Manager
- Wendy Taylor – I-405 Project Team, Kirkland Contract Manager
- Gene Niemasz – I-405 Project Team, Kirkland Deputy Contract Manager
- Tracy McKenzie – I-405 Project Team, Regulatory Compliance Leader
- Chad Durand – I-405 Project Team, Permitting Lead
- Colleen Gants – I-405 Project Team, Public Information
- Rosemarie Buchanan – I-405 Project Team, Public Information Assistant

4.3 Overview of Nickel Projects – Christina Martinez

Christina explained how the Nickel Projects fit into the I-405 Implementation Plan. She mentioned that the Nickel Projects are the first phase of implementing I-405 improvements and that the Kirkland Nickel Project already has funding for construction of the project. She explained that the North Renton Project was ahead of the Kirkland Nickel Project in terms of environmental documentation, but that the North Renton Project was not a “Nickel” project. Christina then encouraged meeting attendees to ask some questions:

Comment: The term “Nickel” is a strange one. Does this term imply that you wanted more, or is it saying that you get a lot for a nickel? (John Anderson, Puget Sound Clean Air Agency)

Response: The Master Plan for the entire I-405 corridor would cost approximately 10.9 billion dollars to fully implement its vision. To make the plan feasible, an implementation plan was developed in order to guide and phase project development. In the spring of 2003, the State Legislature passed a transportation package, and designated \$486 million dollars to fund three specific projects along I-405 in Renton, Bellevue, and Kirkland and for further design and assessment of the corridor.

Comment: Please explain where “in time” we are with the Bellevue project because I was invited to the North Renton Agency Scoping Meeting and this one, but not for the Bellevue project? (Terry Swanson, Washington State Department of Ecology)

Response: We have not kicked off the Bellevue or South Renton Projects yet. We will notify you when we begin the Bellevue and South Renton Project environmental documentation. We plan to kick-off the environmental documentation for the Bellevue and South Renton Projects by the end of this year.

Comment: Why did you kick-off the North Renton Project for environmental documentation if there are no construction dollars identified to build it? (Eddie Low, City of Bothell)

Response: Often times we begin the environmental documentation process when there are no construction dollars available. We want to be ready to build the project if or when we receive funding. Also, we received funding for preliminary engineering and planning for the North Renton Project.

Comment: It would be useful to create a chart showing all the I-405 projects that are currently moving forward. (Kurt Buchanan, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife)

Response: Comment has been noted; thank you.

Comment: Clearly define what it means when you say, “going ahead”? (Eddie Low, City of Bothell)

Response: It means that we are initiating the environmental documentation for the project.

Comment: Would you consider the North Renton Project a Nickel Project? (Terry Swanson, Department of Ecology)

Response: No, North Renton is not funded by the Nickel Package, but it is a project under funding consideration by the Regional Transportation Investment District (RTID).

Comment: I’m confused about the recent interchange improvements at I-405 and SR 167; what was this project? (Terry Swanson, Department of Ecology)

Response: This project was not part of the I-405 Corridor Program.

Comment: What percent of the current I-405/SR 167 interchange would be retained/saved when we go to construct the North Renton Project that is part of the I-405 Implementation Plan? (Joe Seet, City of Woodinville)

Response: Not much of the existing interchange would be saved; there is no intention of saving the ramps. The benefit/cost ratio of the recently constructed interchange was so large, that the interchange was constructed to alleviate traffic problems until the South Renton Project can get built, which could take several years.

Comment: Because there are many projects that are currently being constructed along I-405, such as the ongoing construction in Bellevue, we need to create a list of all the existing and proposed projects along the I-405 corridor, to show how they will fit together with all of the I-405 projects. (Ann Martin, KCDOT)

Response: The comment was noted, and a list was started. See attachment for the list of projects.

Comment: A few suggestions for the I-405 Progress Report (Winter 2004) would be to put in parenthesis under the North Renton Project, “Not a Nickel Project” and under the South Renton Project, “Nickel Project”. (Terry Swanson, Department of Ecology)

Response: Comment has been noted; thank you.

Comment: In regards the I-405 Progress Report, it would also be a good idea to put in context that the South Renton Nickel Project is not a throwaway project because the benefit-cost ratio of constructing the existing interchange at SR 167 was so high; as it will serve to reduce traffic congestion for many years until the South Renton Nickel can be built. (Eddie Low, City of Bothell)

Response: Comment has been noted; thank you.

Comment: Do you currently have any traffic analysis models, volumes, phasing? If so, will local agencies be able to review and provide input on these models? (Joe Seet, City of Woodinville)

Response: Yes, we are doing these things right now. Traffic volume numbers will be made available to all concerned agencies. If you have a concern with those numbers, the project segment manager can sit down with you and discuss your concerns to ensure that future transportation projects in your area are being taken into consideration.

Comment: Woodinville is concerned that they may not be included in the mitigation process for the Kirkland Nickel Project because the City does not lie immediately adjacent to the corridor. Although this City does not lie immediately adjacent, the Kirkland Nickel Project will affect its arterials. (Joe Seet, City of Woodinville)

Response: Although the City of Woodinville is not immediately adjacent to the I-405 corridor, the City still lies within the project's study area. Because the City of Woodinville lies within the study area, potential traffic impacts would be analyzed and measures to avoid or minimize impacts would be considered.

Comment: When looking at the I-405 Progress Report (Winter 2004), it looks like the City of Woodinville is being omitted from the Kirkland Nickel Project, but remember that Woodinville was included in the corridor-wide mitigation efforts and therefore they must also be included in the Kirkland Nickel Project's mitigation efforts. (Joe Seet, City of Woodinville)

Response: Comment has been noted; thank you.

4.4 Project Description

4.4.1 Corridor ROD to Individual Project, Purpose and Need, Project Limits/Termini – Keith McGowan

We started out with a corridor-wide focus; we took consideration of everyone's input and then came up with 300 individual projects along the entire stretch of I-405. From this list of 300 individual projects, multimodal alternatives were developed and analyzed within the I-405 Corridor Program Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The Selected Alternative for the I-405 corridor, also known as the "Master Plan," was documented in a federal Record of Decision in October 2002.

Today we are here to specifically discuss the Kirkland Nickel Project, as we are now moving from corridor-level analysis to project-level environmental documentation. It is important to mention that this process has been going on for a few years now and it has involved many interdisciplinary teams such as an Executive Committee; Steering Committee; Citizens Committee, etc., to evolve the project to where it is today. Today we are interested in hearing your comments and concerns specifically related to the Kirkland Nickel Project.

Comment: We hope that the I-405 project can take credit for more air quality benefits than what is listed in the tri-fold document. I brought a handout that identifies some types of air quality issues we would like to see the project address. Since I-405 has already shown regional conformity, my main concerns are going to be related to the construction of the project including: demolition, construction dust, construction air quality conformity, diesel emissions (we should consider using ultra-low sulfur diesel because the cost is lower today than before), and construction vehicle idling. (John Anderson, PSCAA)

Response: Comment has been noted; thank you.

4.4.2 Proposed Project Improvements and Impacts – Gene Niemasz

There are a number of goals we will keep in mind as we go through the process of designing specific projects within the I-405 corridor. Some of these goals include design efficiency, meeting the project description, minimizing throwaway features, and setting the stage for environmental permitting. It is important that we design the Nickel Projects in a way which will allow them to complement future projects listed in the I-405 Implementation Plan. In addition, we are coordinating with other projects that are currently being designed and constructed along the I-405 corridor.

All attendees received a Kirkland Nickel Project Environmental Overview Binder, which includes aerial maps with the Kirkland Nickel Project design overlay. Pages 7 through 9 provide a narrative, which will help you understand the proposed improvements as you review the 11 by 17 color project diagrams.

Comment: Could you include in your project description (in the binder), any areas of auxiliary lanes so we know where pavement will be added as opposed to where re-striping will occur (Ann Martin, KCDOT)?

Response: Comment has been noted; thank you.

The City of Kirkland may have accurate mapping of streams and surface water bodies located near NE 70th Street. I suggest you review this mapping for accuracy rather than re-inventing the wheel. (Kurt Buchanan, WDFW)

Response: Comment has been noted; thank you.

Proposed Project Improvements – Northbound

Gene explained to the group that he was going to give a verbal “walk-through” of the Kirkland Nickel Project, to explain the various design components and point out areas of potential environmental concern. Gene started with the northbound project components, starting at the southern end of the project area and moving northward.

Comment: It is hard to track/understand where lanes will be added and how many lanes there will be. It would be beneficial to add an auxiliary lane description to the word table on pages 7 through 9 of the overview binder. (Ann Martin, KCDOT)

Response: Comment has been noted; thank you.

Comment: The plots you included in the overview binder should show streams locations. Furthermore, it should show where the streams become culverts or are open channel and differentiate between ditches and streams. Make sure to go well outside the WSDOT right-of-way to show where streams originate. You may need to look at historical photos in order to determine this. (Kurt Buchanan, WDFW)

Response: Comment was noted. Just to clarify, the wetlands shown in the plots we provided were from National Wetland Inventory maps. The I-405 Project Team did not delineate wetland areas shown in the plots. We will go out and delineate or field verify the presence of wetlands and other environmental features as part of our project-level environmental documentation.

Comment: I would suggest that you look at the wetlands and streams in the wintertime, when delineating them, because they are different in the winter than the summer months. (Bob Penhale, Department of Ecology).

Response: It may work out that this will be the case for the North Renton and Kirkland Projects as a result of their timing, but we may not be able to feasibly do this for other I-405 projects, depending on schedule issues.

Comment: In regard to the design of the ramps at the NE 116th interchange, will this project be considering/addressing operational and safety concerns? (Joe Seet, City of Woodinville)

Response: We looked at approximately 15 different options for this interchange and we considered many things including safety and operational issues. Safety was our number one concern for the design of this interchange, followed by capacity improvements.

Comment: Are the erosion hazard symbols synonymous with the cut slope symbols? I suggest you use a different color for these two lines and only include items in the legend if they are shown in the map. (Kurt Buchanan, WDFW)

Response: Comment has been noted, thank you.

Comment: Will sidewalks remain at the NE 116th Street interchange? What are the other bike/pedestrian impacts or proposed amenities at the NE 116th Street and 124th Street interchanges? (Terry Marpert, City of Redmond)

Response: Under the conservative environmental footprint (aggressive engineering design) that we are presenting today, there would be no sidewalks on the south side of the road (116th Street). However, please note that there are a number of different options that are being carried forward for the design of this interchange. As we go forward with our studies, we will be looking at pedestrian movement through the interchange and safety issues extensively.

Comment: Can we get larger scale plots of the NE 116th Street interchange that will show more detail? (Joe Seet, City of Woodinville)

Response: Yes, please contact Gene Niemasz for additional/alternate drawings.

Comment: You really need to consider pedestrian access at the NE 116th Street interchange. Pedestrian access should not be sacrificed at the expense of vehicle speeds. Need to consider the additional distance and travel time it would take pedestrians to get somewhere as a result of the proposed project. Also need to consider where transit access by pedestrians should be improved or maintained. (Ann Martin, KCDOT)

Response: These are all important things to consider in the design of the NE 116th Street interchange. Much consideration will be given to pedestrian movement and transit facility access. There are a number of different options that are being carried forward, for the design of this interchange, and the findings of upcoming studies will be considered in regard to the designs.

Comment: Are you considering including bike lanes in your design of the NE 116th Street interchange? (Joe Seet, City of Woodinville)

Response: Yes we are, they are not in the conservative environmental design, but they are included in some of the other options we are developing for this interchange; should additional funding become available or depending on the outcome of our discipline studies.

Concerns from Eddie Low, City of Bothell

- We do not want Kirkland crawl to become Bothell crawl.
- The study should consider eastbound and westbound generator from 522, plus climbing lanes south of SR 522. Southbound could cause bottleneck.
- There are lots of merge/weave issues with HOV on inside and limited sight distance.
- Environmental issue regarding streams: Bothell has stream data layers, and there is a stream where drainage from the freeway causes erosion/flooding/siltation near East Riverside Drive neighborhood as the water tries to reach the stream.

Concerns from Joe Seet, City of Woodinville

- Joe mentioned he is primarily concerned with the traffic/secondary effects of traffic on arterials and neighborhood streets. The City of Woodinville really wants to be part of the process and have their concerns addressed.
- 124th is Woodinville City limits and 160th is a major truck line that dumps traffic onto 124th NB.
- NB approach 124th – Kirkland crawl should not be carried north into Bothell.
- If we are investing south of Bothell, we do not want the “Kirkland Crawl” to become the “Bothell Stall.”

At the end of the lunch break, Christina reinforced that we need to focus on Kirkland Nickel Project issues as Gene goes through the second half of the project description.

Proposed Project Improvements – Southbound

Gene began his description of the proposed southbound project improvements at the northern most end of the project area, near the Bothell/Woodinville interchange.

Comment: The NW corner of the Bothell/Woodinville interchange is the location of the UW Cascadia Community College that is planned to triple in size. The I-405 project needs to make sure it coordinates/fits with the plans for the UW Cascadia South Access Project. (Eddie Low, City of Bothell)

Response: After we determine projected traffic volumes for this interchange, we will make those numbers available to the agencies and the potentially affected jurisdictions. We will be willing to sit down with concerned parties to discuss the volumes and whether or not they assume additional capacity as a result of other projects that will be completed within the area.

Comment: The Sammamish River contains ESA species. On this map, the Sammamish River is shown as a wetland when it should be shown as surface water or shoreline. Need to fix the plots to show water resources and things identified in the legend. (Kurt Buchanan, WDFW)

Response: Comment has been noted; thank you.

Comment: Sheet 7 shows landslide hazard areas, but it needs to be further evaluated in the discipline reports to show erosion hazard areas also. Especially considering its proximity to people and water bodies.

Response: Comment has been noted; thank you.

Comment: Isn't there a wetland that is located south of what is shown as wetlands at the Brickyard Park-and-Ride? (Ann Martin, KCDOT)

Response: There may be, we will be reviewing a wetlands report that was completed by King County regarding wetlands in the vicinity of the Brickyard Park-and-Ride.

Comment: There is a Sound Transit Totem Lake Project that will provide a direct-access HOV ramp from the transit center located at the SE corner of NE 128th and 120th (near Evergreen Hospital). (Dave Godfrey, City of Kirkland).

Response: We currently have AutoCAD files that show our project connecting to this one. We have coordinated with Sound Transit to ensure consistency with their project.

Comment: It would be beneficial to show the linkage between the Kirkland Nickel Project design and Sound Transit's Totem Lake Direct Access HOV project.

Response: Comment has been noted; thank you.

Comment: I am concerned about potential stormwater-related impacts occurring within a stream that crosses I-405 just south of station 9360. There are resident cutthroat trout present in this stream as it goes down into the larger wetland at Edith Park. Runoff impacting this stream and Juanita Creek is a big issue. (Kurt Buchanan, WDFW).

Response: Comment has been noted; thank you.

Comment: Adjacent to the McDonalds there is a stream that goes into the wetland (west). Many years ago there was a Kirkland development project that debated whether it was a stream, wetland, ditch, etc., and the presence or absence of fish. There may be some good information out there. In addition, anadromous Coho salmon went up to the culvert at I-405 near the NW quadrant of the 124th Street interchange between 124th Street and 128th to the west. (Kurt Buchanan, WDFW)

Response: Comment has been noted; thank you.

Can we get a DRAFT version of these meeting notes?

Response: Yes, no problem.

Comment: There is a culvert branch of Forbes Creek that goes underneath a triangle-shaped parking lot. That parking lot has a history of culvert blowouts, flooding, etc. (Kurt Buchanan, WDFW)

Response: Dave Godfrey mentioned that he could provide all kinds of flooding information and history about this site. Kurt Buchanan mentioned that there are numerous potential mitigation options that could occur in this area.

Comment: The pedestrian crossing that is located at NE 100th Street is also an emergency vehicle crossing (Sheet 3). (Dave Godfrey, City of Kirkland)

Response: Comment has been noted; thank you.

Comment: Are there any water features, such as wetlands or streams in the watershed park, or vicinity (Sheet 1)? (Ann Martin, KCDOT)

Response: Dave Godfrey mentioned that he could get us his city's latest information/data regarding this area.

4.4.3 Drainage Design Discussion – Gene Niemasz

Gene mentioned that the drainage report for the Kirkland Nickel Project was in the process of being completed and discipline report authors will utilize it. Goals for the drainage design are similar to the previously mentioned design goals in the sense that they are trying to accommodate the various project components, while at the same time complement projects from the implementation plan that may occur in the future. Gene stressed that there will be more of a watershed-based focus for this project.

Comment: How will new impervious surfaces be treated? Will there be an attempt to treat the existing impervious pavement? (Nancy Brennan-Dubbs, USFWS)

Response: The hydraulic engineers are considering treating 140 percent of the new impervious per the WSDOT instructional letter. In addition, we are anticipating new guidance on stormwater treatment as a result of the WSDOT Highway Runoff Manual revision currently underway.

Comment: I believe that there are portions of the I-405 corridor that are not currently treating stormwater runoff. Need to look into this further. (Kurt Buchanan, WDFW)

Response: Comment has been noted; thank you.

Comment: If you treat 140 percent of the new impervious surface, this will take care of some of the existing untreated impervious surfaces, but the quality of the water going into streams, wetlands, etc., may still be poor, so what is the point of spending money on it? Need to look at the entire system and determine what the best treatment is and how the money will provide the greatest overall benefit. (Kurt Buchanan, WDFW)

Response: This is an excellent reason why it is important for us to take a watershed-based approach to drainage design and mitigation. Comment has been noted; thank you.

Comment: You will have to calculate the existing amount of runoff that is caused by the I-405 pavement and document where the runoff travels into streams and water systems in order to determine the appropriate level of treatment. (Eric Shields, City of Kirkland)

Response: Comment has been noted; thank you.

Comment: If we have a basin-wide approach vs. project-level mitigation, are we all going to be on the same page when it comes time to agree on the project? (Jim Leonard, FHWA)

Response: We are planning on doing project-level mitigation where impacts demand onsite mitigation. The Early Environmental Investments program is targeting watershed improvements and has had numerous meetings to begin establishing agreements with all the jurisdictions.

4.5 Early Environmental Investment Program Questions

Comment: Where does the funding come from? (Dave Godfrey, City of Kirkland)

Response: Money that would otherwise be spent on traditional mitigation will be used to fund Early Environmental Investments. The cost of mitigation is included in the cost of building transportation projects.

Comment: What is the mechanism for selecting which early environmental projects are chosen? Who connects those to specific projects such as the Kirkland Nickel? (Dave Godfrey, City of Kirkland)

Response: We have set up a mitigation task force, comprised of all the federal, state, and local agencies with each jurisdiction. This task force developed a collaborative process for screening, ranking, and selecting mitigation opportunities.

Comment: Various agencies were involved in the EEI meetings. Are they all on-board or are we planning on finalizing an agreement. Need to consider getting a greater level of commitment through an MOU/MOA on the EEI program. (Jim Leonard, FHWA)

Response: We do not currently have a MOU/MOA specifically, but we definitely have a head-nod saying it is a good idea. We plan to establish an MOU or MOA on the Early Environmental Investment projects and mitigation credit they provide.

Comment: I feel that an MOU for the EEI program would be a good idea. (Terry Swanson, Ecology)

Response: Comment has been noted; thank you.

Comment: Because the EEI program is a relatively new idea and people are not used to doing this, there needs to be a way to document what was agreed upon. In addition, there needs to be a tracking system that shows exactly what the commitments are. This will greatly reduce confusion and the amount of time wasted when new staff comes aboard. (Kurt Buchanan, WDFW)

Response: Comment has been noted; thank you.

Comment: An idea for conversation is to track and use the additional benefits of doing EEI during negotiations. Commit to doing more than the minimum since offsite should be less costly. (Ann Martin, KCDOT)

4.6 NEPA and Permitting – Keith McGowan and Tracey McKenzie

In regards to the preparation of discipline reports and the project schedule, we are going to kick off the environmental team tomorrow, now that the scoping has been completed. There will be a wide array of discipline reports including an Environmental Justice analysis. By this summer we will know what type of document we will be preparing. It could be possible that a Documented Categorical Exclusion (DCE) will be prepared if we find that impacts are very minimal or we might find that we have to do an EIS. If we decide to do an Environmental Assessment (EA), then we can expect a draft of the document to come out sometime around December of 2004.

Comment: What is the timeline for preparation of the discipline reports? Where do the agencies fit in with the review of discipline reports? (Kurt Buchanan, WDFW)

Response: The discipline reports have various due dates. Some of them will be out this spring/summer. We were not planning on releasing the discipline reports to all the agencies to comment on them. However, we could make them available if you would like to provide some feedback.

Comment: What are the timeline differences for a Documented CE versus an EA? (Dave Godfrey, City of Kirkland)

Response: Potentially 3 to 4 months.

Comment: What about the public involvement process if we decided to go to a Documented CE

Response: Our public involvement plan has as much involvement as would be required for an EIS. Our current plan is to do public involvement at the EA level. Therefore, should the project go to an EIS, we will not be lacking the necessary public involvement requirements.

4.6.1 Permitting Approach/Roles and Expectations – Tracey McKenzie

We will be doing a regulatory analysis in the spring that will look at the requirements of the Endangered Species Act (ESA), the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES), etc., to determine adequate compliance for the I-405 projects. We will continue to meet with the natural resource agencies throughout the spring and summer, and will be submitting permit applications around the winter of 2004/2005. We expect that all of the permits we apply for will be issued within 12 months from their submittal date, many of the permits will be issued much sooner than this. If a particular agency feels they are lacking resources, and may have difficulty reviewing and granting the permit within the 12-month schedule, we want to know as soon as possible. The Nickel Projects are high priority and there is an increased level of accountability to keep these projects on schedule.

Comment: What have you decided in terms of the ESA consultation? Are you planning on doing a project-level Biological Assessment or a corridor-wide one? (Jim Leonard, FHWA)

Response: We are meeting with the natural resource agencies to discuss this very issue, so we will have to put this question off for future discussions.

Comment: In regards to project timelines and schedule, which project is first, North Renton or the Kirkland Nickel Project? (Terry Swanson, Ecology)

Response: The Kirkland Nickel Project will be built first because it already has approved construction dollars while the North Renton Project does not. However, the environmental documentation for the North Renton Project is ahead of the Kirkland Nickel Project. If you receive two documents to review, Kirkland should take priority because it is part of the Nickel Projects and there is increased accountability to make sure these projects stay on schedule and within budget so they can be constructed on time.

Comment: I agree that it is very beneficial to know which project takes precedence. On a different note, when you approach doing the ESA Consultation, and you have to determine fish presence, the KC Dept. National Resources may have the most up to date information. Kurt will check for information from his Department and send us that information. (Kurt Buchanan, WDFW)

Comment: Comment has been noted; thank you.

Comment: Thought we did an excellent job of clarifying things/answering questions and presenting. (Terry Swanson, Ecology)

Response: Comment has been noted; thank you.

Comment: In the unlikely event that RTID did not pass; what would happen to the schedule of the Kirkland Nickel Project? (Dave Godfrey, City of Kirkland)

Response: We would still build it, but the project phasing may be altered.

Comment: If High Occupancy/Transit (HOT) Lanes come up at tonight's meeting, how will you address the issue? (Ann Martin, KCDOT)

Response: HOT lanes are not a part of this project. However, if we decided to look at managed lanes in the future, any decision on managed lanes would require additional environmental documentation addressing that issue.

Comment: In regards to mapping, if you know where construction staging areas are, it would be good to show those areas on the plots and how water quality would be handled. (Kurt Buchanan, WDFW)

Response: Comment has been noted; thank you.

Comment: The I-405/SR 522 interchange is becoming a very busy area for transportation with the planned community college access project. This should be taken into consideration for this project. Please note that the I-405/SR 522 area will be a "Hot Spot" for our agency in regard to fish, streams, wetlands, and trailer park (EJ issues?). (Kurt Buchanan, WDFW)

Response: Comment has been noted; thank you.

Comment: How much area/ vegetated area/ habitat would be lost? There is the potential for temperature changes as a result of the project. (Nancy Brennan-Dubbs, U.S Fish and Wildlife Service)

Response: Vegetated areas and habitat lost as a result of the project will be determined in the future. Comment has been noted; thank you.

Comment: Learn from the Tacoma Narrows Project in regards to the public's perception of drastic changes to the landscape (e.g., removed trees and public was shocked). Need to stress all of the effects during the public involvement process. (Terry Swanson, Ecology)

Response: Comment has been noted; thank you.

Comment: We agree that it is important to tell the public when trees/visual changes will occur. Even though they are presented/documents in the EIS/EA, the public will not read through the entire document to look for these things. (David Godfrey, City of Kirkland)

Response: Comment has been noted; thank you.

4.7 Meeting Wrap-up at 1:50 p.m. – Christina Martinez

- Thanks to everyone
- Submit written comments by March 1
- Get Meeting notes draft to agencies